The Addressee(s) of Sapph. fr. 112 V.
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"Ολβιε γάμβρε, κοι μὲν δὴ γάμος ὡς ἄραο<br>ἐκτετέλεϲτ', ἔχειϲ δὲ παρθένον, ἃν ἄραο.<br>κοι χάριεν μὲν εἶδοϲ, ὄππατα ⟨δ’. …⟩<br>μέλλιχ’, ἔροϲ δ’ ἐπ’ ἰμέρτωι κέχυται προϲώπωι<br>5 ⟨……………..⟩ τετίμακ’ ἐξοχά c’ Ἀφροδίτα
This is the text of Sappho’s fragment as it is printed in modern editions.1 It is the result of a combination of Hephaestion’s quotations of lines 1-2 and 4 with Weil’s reconstruction of a prosaic paraphrase of lines 3-5 found in Choricius.2 However, there are serious objections to the arrangement of lines 1-2 and 3-5 in a continuous sequence, or even as part of the same poem, as this does not necessarily follow from the way that Hephaestion introduces his two quotations.3 Given our ignorance of Sappho’s original range of metres, the fact that both sections share the same period (cho ba | cho ba) must be of little significance. Hence the two sections are best kept apart. The same is true for

1 Unless stated otherwise, references to fragments of Sappho and Alcaeus are to the edition of Voigt 1971.
2 Heph. 15.26 καὶ τὸ ἐκ χοριαμβικῶν ἑφθημιμερῶν τῶι εἰϲ τὴν ἰαμβικήν κατάκλειδα, ἡ αὐτὴ ποίητρια· ἢ βιοι γαμβράε, κοι μὲν δὴ γάμος, ὡς ἄραο, ἐκτετέλεϲτ’, ἔχειϲ δὲ παρθένον, ἃν ἄραο, κάϲθ’ ὅπου συνήψε τὴν λέξιν· ‘μελλίχροοϲ δ’ ἐπ’ ἰμερτῶι κέχυται προϲώπωι’, Chor. Zach. 19 ἐγὼ δὲ τὴν νύμφην… Σιφρική πελωδίαι κοκυήσω· κοι χάριεν μὲν εἶδοϲ καὶ ὄμματα μεληχρά, ἔρωϲ δὲ καλῶι περικέχυται προϲώπωι καὶ κάτετεύκηκεν ἐξοχάς ἡ Ἀφροδίτη, M.H. Weil ap. Graux 1880, 81-82.
3 Similarly Fiorini 1973/1974, 127-128. κάϲθ’ ὅπου does not mean ‘at the same place too’, but ‘there are also cases where’, i.e. ‘it is also possible that’; cf. Heph. 2.5, where, in the discussion of synecphonesis and its various combinations, Hephaestion introduces the combination of short and long syllable followed by vowel with ἔϲτι δὲ ὅπου καὶ βραχεία καὶ κοινὴ ἀντὶ βραχείας παραλαμβάνονται ὡς ἐν τοι [II. 3.152] καὶ [II. 1.15 = 1.374].
the attempt, dating back to Hermann, to alter the text of Sapph. fr. 116 (χαῖρε, νύμφα, χαῖρε, τίμιε γάμβρε, πόλλα) so that it scans the same metre as fr. 112, and to attach it to the end of fr. 112.4

Once the address to the bridegroom in lines 1-2 is separated from lines 3-5, the addressee of lines 3-5 becomes particularly uncertain. Three possibilities are conceivable. First, all three lines are addressed to the bridegroom.5 Second, all three lines are addressed to the bride. Third, the first two lines are addressed to the bride, while the last is addressed to the bridegroom.6 Certainty is unattainable. However, the first option seems particularly unlikely as it entails the assumption that Choricius would have redirected an entire passage, originally addressing the bridegroom, to the bride. It is hard to conceive why he would have chosen this instead of a Sapphic passage originally addressing the bride. Moreover, while the adjective χαρίειϲ may in itself not be gender-specific,7 the description of the bridegroom’s appearance with this term would seem out of place in a wedding song, where the bride tends to be praised for her grace and beauty (e.g. fr. 108 ὦ κάλα, ὦ χαρίεϲϲα κόρα), the groom for his strength and height (e.g. fr. 111, 115).

A decision between the second and third options is complicated by the fact that Catullan imitations of line 5, containing strong verbal echoes, are directed at the bridegroom.8 Hence either Choricius or Catullus decided to change the addressee of the last line of the Sapphic original. While such creativity would be expected of Catullus rather than Choricius, the use of the verb τιμᾶν in line 5 might indicate that Catullus in fact preserves the original addressee of this line. Elsewhere in Greek poetry, when a deity bestows τιμή (or φιλία) onto a human, this tends to result in an increase in qualities like strength, glory, wealth, or happiness, which raises the recipient above his fellow mortals.9 In this sense,

---

4 Cf. Hermann 1831, 260 = 1835, 128. By reading either χαῖρε (_DER) or χαῖρε(ΤΕ), νύμφα, Hermann produces the period cho ba | cho ba. Cf. also Wilamowitz 1900, 73 n. 2; Treu 1958, 90.
5 Cf. Fiorini 1973/1974 and Bowra 1934, 175-176, who, however, interprets everything from ὄππατα to προϲώπωι as a description of the bride addressed to the bridegroom.
6 Cf. Page 1955, 122 n. 3; Treu 1958, 91. Campbell 1990, 137 assigns line 3 to the bride without specifying his view on lines 4-5.
7 Cf. the differentiation in LfgrE s.v. 1.a-c, 1140.20-43. Cf. also Alc. fr. 368 κέλομαι τινα τὸν χαρίεντα Μένωνα κάλεϲϲαι, | αἰ χρῆ ϲυμποϲίαϲ ἐπόναϲιν ἔμοιγε γένεϲθαι.
8 Cf. Catul. 61.189-192 at marite, ita me iuuent | caelites, nihil minus | pulcer es, neque te Venus | neglegit, 195-198 bona te Venus | iuuerit, quoniam palpam | quad cupis cupis, et bonum | non abscondis amor.<<
9 Cf. the material collected in Keyssner 1932, 67-70 and LfgrE s.v. τιμάω ibs, 516.14-517.4.